

look-alike mailings. Further, the bill directs sweepstakes companies to adopt procedures to prevent the mailing of these materials to anyone who submits a request stating their intent not to receive these mailings.

This bill has the strong support of the Postal Service. In providing the Postal Service with the ability to protect consumers through civil enforcement, the bill further grants the Postal Service administrative subpoena authority. It will also give U.S. district courts the ability to impose nationwide temporary training orders.

As a strong proponent of federalism, I think it is important that this bill does not preempt the authority of the state attorneys general and various consumer protection agencies which also combat deceptive mailings. The Postal Service and these agencies have a history of cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of these cases. The Postal Service reports that this collective effort has produced significant results in policing a variety of frauds while enabling state prosecution efforts to investigate questionable promotion practices beyond their state borders. S. 335 will not only improve the Postal Service's ability to investigate and stop deceptive mailings, but it will also help state attorneys general work more effectively against fraud.

This bill represents the bipartisan efforts of a number of Senators. S. 335 was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Governmental Affairs with the support of both myself and the ranking minority member, Senator LIEBERMAN. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the hard work put forth by the bill's sponsor, Senator COLLINS, and other cosponsors of the legislation including Senators COCHRAN, LEVIN, and EDWARDS. In addition I want to acknowledge the role of Senator CAMPBELL in first introducing legislation last year on this issue. His efforts served as the genesis for the successful investigative and legislative efforts we have seen this year.

In conclusion, Mr. President, S. 335 presents a balanced and fair approach in protecting consumers from misleading and fraudulent sweepstakes and related mailings, while not unduly burdening those mailers who legitimately use the mail as an advertising medium. I urge all Senators to support Senate approval of S. 335.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan.

I am delighted to stand in support of defending S. 335, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act. I commend my colleague from Michigan, along with Senators COLLINS, COCHRAN, and EDWARDS, for the way they have worked together with my former colleagues, the State attorneys general, the AARP, and the sweepstakes industry itself to put together this important consumer protection legislation. I think their combined efforts stand as a model not only of cooperation but of thoughtful legislating from which we can all learn. I am very proud to join them as a cosponsor of this bill.

No marketing effort should be based on misleading advertising. That principle is at the core of the legislation before the Senate. It reminds everyone that occasionally the Federal Government has to step in to make sure that the free market we celebrate and benefit so much from truly remains free. That freedom is so often based on the truthfulness of representations made by those who are marketing.

The purpose of this bill is to eliminate deceptive practices in the sweepstakes industry. We have all seen them. Who wouldn't be tantalized by a letter proclaiming you may already be a winner? It is hard not to open that one up. Everybody wants to be a winner. Most of us have probably fantasized about how we would spend a sudden windfall that dropped into our bank accounts.

Unfortunately, sweepstakes mailings often involve sophisticated marketing techniques that persuade recipients to spend money in the hope of finding the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, but it is a long way off in almost all cases. Often the mailings are targeted at the elderly or the financially vulnerable who don't realize that sweepstakes companies are not in business primarily to rain riches down upon them. Sweepstakes companies are in business to sell products that make a profit, plain and simple. That is legitimate so long as they do it fairly and truthfully.

It is a big business. The fact is that sweepstakes and telemarketing firms take in more than \$400 million a year from promotional campaigns in my State of Connecticut alone. Nationally, estimates are that the sweepstakes in telemarketing firms have gross revenues between \$40 and \$60 billion a year. This legislation makes sure that before consumers take a chance on the sweepstakes, they know it is just that, a chance—not a winning ticket, not a prize, but a chance. They will know the odds are not improved no matter how many subscriptions they buy.

This legislation requires a clear statement that no purchase is necessary to win, as well as terms and conditions of the promotion in language

that is easy to find, to read, and to understand. It prohibits abuses we have seen such as symbols or statements that imply Federal Government endorsement, and it provides meaningful disclosures to let consumers know the actual odds of winning.

Further, the bill sets up a mechanism for consumers and those who care for them to stop unwanted sweepstake solicitations and a recordkeeping requirement to assure that such requests are properly implemented.

Finally, the bill gives the Postal Service the additional enforcement authority it needs to stop unlawful sweepstake schemes, particularly those that flirt with fraud and skip from State to State.

I strongly support this legislation as a tool to help consumers negotiate their way through the high pressure sales tactics sometimes employed by marketers using sweepstakes to sell their products. I am very grateful to colleagues on the Governmental Affairs Committee for the leadership they have shown.

I am delighted to join this bipartisan effort to protect our citizens—again, particularly the aged—from these deceptive marketing tactics. I urge the Senate to vote for this strong consumer protection measure. I hope the House will then join in adopting this bill and sending it to the President.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am going to speak for a brief period of time in morning business. I see the Senator from Mississippi is coming into the Chamber. I know we are ready to start with the Ag appropriations bill.

FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to very briefly speak to an issue that actually might be one we will debate as we go through this Ag appropriations bill since part of what we deal with within the Department of Agriculture is food assistance programs such as the Women, Infants, and Children Program and the Food Stamp Program.

We have heard a great deal from the White House and from some Members of Congress about the success of the welfare bill. On Sunday, the White House released data on the number of women who were on welfare and are now working. There will be a gathering in Chicago tomorrow, I believe, where

the President will be talking about welfare to work and talking about the success of this.

As a Senator, I want to raise a couple of questions that I think are important and to focus on some unpleasant facts that we should be willing to face up to.

First of all, I point out for my colleagues the fact that the welfare rolls are down 40 percent begs the question of whether or not we have reduced poverty. The fact of the matter is, the welfare rolls are down 40 percent, but poverty is barely down. The goal was not to reduce the welfare rolls; the goal everybody talked about was to move families from poverty to economic independence. That is really what the goal was all about. The issue has never been welfare; the issue has been poverty.

The question is, How do you reduce the poverty? I do not quite understand how the White House or any Democrat or any Republican can proclaim this a success when we have done so little to reduce poverty in our country, especially poverty of children. There are about 14 million people who are poor in the country.

My second point is, when the President and the White House talk about the number of mothers who are now working, that begs the question as to what kind of jobs and what kind of wages. What we should be talking about are family-wage or living-wage jobs. The evidence we have right now is that most of the mothers who are working are working in jobs with wages somewhere between about \$5.50 and \$7 an hour, which is barely above minimum wage but does not enable these families to escape poverty.

My third point is, Families USA just came out with a study that points out there are about 675,000 low-income citizens who have now been cut off medical assistance because of the welfare bill. There are about 675,000 low-income citizens who no longer are receiving any medical assistance.

My final point is, there was a Wall Street Journal piece today about the dramatic, precipitous decline of participation in the Food Stamp Program. I argue especially the decline of participation among children which cannot be explained alone by the state of the economy, especially with the dramatic increase in the use of food shelf service.

What is going on? Do we have a situation now where the AFDC structure is no longer there, and when people come in, no one tells them about the fact they and their families are eligible for food stamps—that is happening—or they are not told they are eligible for medical assistance—that is happening—all of which leads me to two final things today as we move into this debate about the Agriculture appropriations bill.

First, I lost by one vote on a welfare tracking amendment, and then the

Senate adopted it on the Treasury-Postal bill. It is now in conference committee. The amendment called upon the States, when they apply for the \$1 billion bonus money, to present to Health and Human Services the data on what kind of jobs women have, whether or not they and their children are participating in food stamps and do the families have medical assistance, so we can find out if families are better off or worse off. That is now in conference. If that gets taken out of conference committee—amendments are adopted in the Senate and taken out in conference committee—I am going to bring that amendment back up on this bill, and we are going to have a vote because sometimes we do not know what we do not want to know, and sometimes we only know what we want to know.

That is the way it is with the White House about this welfare bill. We ought to be engaged in an honest policy evaluation to find out what is happening in the country. We are talking about poor women and poor children, and we ought to know whether they are better off or whether they are worse off. There is some disturbing evidence that many of these families might, in fact, be worse off. It is a little early and premature for the White House to be declaring this a success or for any Senator or Representative, Democrat or Republican, to be declaring it a success.

My final point is, since we are dealing with an Ag appropriations bill—and I think I will have an amendment to this effect—we need to call on USDA, or someone, to do a study and to report back to the Senate and to the Congress in a relatively brief period of time, as soon as possible, what is happening with the Food Stamp Program in this country. We need to know.

There was a dramatic piece in the Washington Post about 2 weeks ago. I could hardly bear to read it. It was the front page of the B section. It was a picture of an 8-year-old child, a little boy. The whole piece was devoted to hungry children in the District of Columbia.

The gist of the article was that in August—now—the summer schools are going to shut down and the breakfasts will not be there, the School Lunch Program will not be there, and there is no food at home.

In this particular family, this grandmother with four children does not have enough money to feed her children. What I want to know is, whatever happened to the Food Stamp Program? That has been our safety net program. What is going on when we have a dramatic rise in the use of food shelves and food pantries in this country? The Catholic Church network study pointed this out just last month.

What is going on when 675,000 low-income people are removed from medical assistance as a result of the welfare

bill? What is going on when the vast majority of these women are working at jobs that still do not get them and their families out of poverty? What is going on when we are unwilling to do an honest policy evaluation of this legislation, because very soon in many States there will be a drop-dead date certain, and all families, all women, and all children will be cut off from any welfare assistance at all. Before that happens, we need to know what is happening with this legislation.

I have come to the floor of the Senate today to basically challenge my colleagues to make sure this stays in the conference committee and to announce I will be out here on the floor with an amendment if it gets eliminated from the conference committee, and to announce we ought to also have a study of the Food Stamp Program to find out why it is not reaching children and families who need the help, and also to directly challenge the White House and the President. It is not enough to say we have cut the rolls by 40 percent. The question is, Have we reduced the poverty by 40 percent? We have not.

It is not enough to say these mothers are now working. The question is, Are they working jobs that will enable them and their children to no longer be poor in our country? That is the goal which I do not believe has been met.

We are talking about the lives of poor women and poor children. They deserve to be on our radar screen. They deserve an honest, rigorous policy evaluation so that we, as decisionmakers, know whether or not, by our actions, we are helping these women and children or whether or not we are hurting these women and children. We ought to have the courage to step up to the plate.

I think we are about ready to start on the Ag appropriations bill. I will yield the floor. I look forward to this debate. I came down here on the floor to debate this bill. This is the crisis that is staring my State of Minnesota in the face. I am going to leave it up to Senator HARKIN or Senator DASCHLE to start out debate on our side, but I am very anxious to be in this debate and very anxious to speak for farmers and for agriculture.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.